IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS TEXARKANA DIVISION

ALLESTER STEVENS,

Plaintiff,

V.

CIVIL ACTION NO. 5:21-CV-112-RWS-JBB

BOWIE COUNTY CORRECTIONAL
CENTER, ET AL.,

Defendant.

ORDER

Before the Court is Plaintiff Allester Stevens's civil action complaining of alleged deprivations of his constitutional rights. Docket No. 1. The case was referred to United States Magistrate Judge Boone Baxter in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636. The Magistrate Judge issued a Report recommending that the lawsuit be dismissed for failure to state a claim upon which relief may be granted and for failure to prosecute. Docket No. 5.

A copy of the Report was sent to Plaintiff at his last known address, Bowie County Correctional Center, but was returned as undeliverable. Docket No. 6. To date, Plaintiff has not advised the Court of his current mailing address. The complaint form which Plaintiff signed contains a declaration saying "I understand, if I am released or transferred, it is my responsibility to keep the court informed of my current mailing address and failure to do so may result in the dismissal of this lawsuit." Docket No. 1 at 5. Accordingly, Plaintiff has failed to prosecute his lawsuit by not advising the Court of his current mailing address.

Because no objections have been received, Plaintiff is barred from *de novo* review by the District Judge of the Magistrate Judge's proposed findings, conclusions and recommendations and, except upon grounds of plain error, from appellate review of the unobjected-to factual findings

Case 5:21-cv-00112-RWS-JBB Document 7 Filed 06/21/24 Page 2 of 2 PageID #: 19

and legal conclusions accepted and adopted by the District Court. See Duarte v. City of Lewisville,

Texas, 858 F.3d 348, 352 (5th Cir. 2017); Arriaga v. Laxminarayan, Case No. 4:21-CV-00203-

RAS, 2021 WL 3287683, at *1 (E.D. Tex. July 31, 2021).

The Court has reviewed the pleadings in this case and the Report of the Magistrate Judge.

Upon such review, the Court has determined the Report of the Magistrate Judge is correct. See

United States v. Wilson, 864 F.2d 1219, 1221 (5th Cir. 1989) (where no objections to a Magistrate

Judge's Report are filed, the standard of review is "clearly erroneous, abuse of discretion and

contrary to law"). Accordingly, it is

ORDERED that the Report of the Magistrate Judge (Docket No. 5) is **ADOPTED** as the

opinion of the District Court. It is further

ORDERED that the above-captioned action is **DISMISSED WITHOUT PREJUDICE**

for failure to state a claim upon which relief may be granted and for failure to prosecute.

So ORDERED and SIGNED this 21st day of June, 2024.

ROBERT W. SCHROEDER III

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE